

The Applicant would like to thank Examiner Noguerola for his comments and suggestions in the telephone interview held March 24, 2008. In the interview, Examiner Noguerola suggested amending the specification to more simply and more clearly describe the embodiments illustrated in the Figures.

The rejections of claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement issued in the Office Action dated August 31, 2007 were maintained. Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection.

Specifically, the Examiner rejected the claims because it was not clear how “convective” flow is generated in the device.

Claims 1, 11, 19, and 22 have been amended to replace “convective” with “fluid”. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the previous office action. The electroosmotic flow from reservoir R2 to reservoir R3 in Figure 1 induces fluid flow in channel 18. Additionally, Applicant notes that the claims do not recite specific direction of fluid flow. Applicant submits that amended claims 1, 11, 19, and 22 are enabled and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Martin Sulsky/  
Martin Sulsky  
Registration No.: 45,403

Docket No.: 21058/0206803-US0

{ W:\21058\0206803-us0\01553737.DOC 00000000000000000000000000000000 }